



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/772,165	02/04/2004	Brad R. Larson	200314257-1	5183

22879 7590 10/17/2008
HEWLETT PACKARD COMPANY
P O BOX 272400, 3404 E. HARMONY ROAD
INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY ADMINISTRATION
FORT COLLINS, CO 80527-2400

EXAMINER

QUIETT, CARRAMAH J

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2622

NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
-------------------	---------------

10/17/2008

ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

JERRY.SHORMA@HP.COM
mkraft@hp.com
ipa.mail@hp.com

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/772,165	Applicant(s) LARSON, BRAD R.	
	Examiner Carramah J. Quiett	Art Unit 2622	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 07/07/2008.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-21 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-21 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 04 February 2004 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Amendment

1. The amendment(s), filed on 07/07/2008, have been entered and made of record. Claims 1-21 are pending.

Response to Arguments

2. Applicant's arguments with respect to **claims 1-18 and 20-21** have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.
3. Applicant's arguments filed 02/27/2008 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Applicant traverses the rejection to **claim 19**, which is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Anderson (U.S. Pat. #6,657,667) in view of Tsuda et al. (U.S. Pat. #6,008,844) does not teach. In particular, Applicant asserts that Tsuda does not teach using video object tracking to track the transparent displayed image as the transparent displayed image moves across the display. The Examiner respectfully disagrees. As illustrated in figs. 5(a)-5(c), Tsuda illustrates an image (111), which becomes transparent (see-through) when it is moved across the display (11). Modifying Anderson with Tsuda provides a high quality display thereby making a natural display irrespective of its aspect ratio (Tsuda, col. 3, lines 16-26). Accordingly, the Examiner maintains the rejection to claim 19 as well as claim 20 which depends on claim 19.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

4. The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.

5. **Claims 1-5, 9, 11-15, and 21** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Anderson (U.S. Pat. #6,657,667) in view of Mukai et al. (U.S. Pat. #5,557,358).

For **claim 1**, Anderson discloses a digital camera system (figs. 1-3) comprising:

a lens (220; col. 3, lines 44-49);

an image sensor (224) for sensing an image viewed by the lens (col. 3, lines 50-56);

a display (402) for displaying the image sensed by the image sensor (col. 4, lines 4-23);

a storage device (350, 354, 356) for storing the image sensed by the image sensor (col. 4, lines 4-36);

processing circuitry (118) coupled to the display, lens, image sensor, and storage device (col. 3, line 26 – col. 4, line 58); and

a processing algorithm that runs on the processing circuitry (col. 4, lines 4-15) that:

provides a user interface (408; col. 5, lines 53-67) for selecting if a composite photograph is to be taken (col. 6, lines 53-61) and for identifying a location of a first photograph to be taken (col. 7, lines 7-35; figs. 7A and 8);

after the first photograph has been taken, overlays indicia on the display indicating an overlapping area within a second photograph that is to be taken (col. 7, lines 31-42; fig. 9); and

uses the overlaid indicia that indicate the overlapping area within the second photograph as the overlaid indicia moves over the image displayed on the display as the camera is moved to a position to take the second photograph, which overlaid indicia is used to align and place the second photograph relative to the first photograph (col. 7, lines 7-42; fig. 9).

However, Anderson does not expressly teach a system that uses video object tracking to track the overlaid indicia.

In a similar field of endeavor, Mukai discloses a system that uses video object tracking to track the overlaid indicia as the overlaid indicia moves over the image displayed on the display (figs. 18-19A/B; col. 8, line 64 – col. 9, line 58). In light of the teach of Mukai, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the system of Anderson with a system as recited in Claim 1 in order to assist the user in determining the composition of the image to be photographed (Mukai, col. 1, lines 26-45).

For **claim 2**, Anderson, as modified by Mukai, discloses the system recited in Claim 1 wherein the algorithm displays a user interface on the display for indicating the size (format) of the desired composite photograph (Anderson col. 7, lines 7-18; fig. 8).

For **claim 3**, Anderson, as modified by Mukai, discloses the system recited in Claim 1 wherein the algorithm displays selection buttons (icons) on the display as part of the user interface to select if a composite photograph is to be taken (Anderson col. 7, lines 7-18; fig. 8).

For **claim 4**, Anderson, as modified by Mukai, discloses the system recited in Claim 1 wherein the algorithm displays a menu for indicating the size of the desired composite photograph (Anderson col. 7, lines 7-18; fig. 8).

For **claim 5**, Anderson, as modified by Mukai, discloses the system recited in Claim 1 wherein the indicia comprises a grid indicating the width and height of the desired composite photograph (Anderson col. 7, lines 7-18; fig. 8).

For **claim 9**, Anderson, as modified by Mukai, discloses the system recited in Claim 1 wherein the algorithm stores the location of photographs that are taken; and after the user selects a location of a subsequent photograph, displays indicia adjacent bordering images to guide the

user's placement of the next photograph relative to the indicia on the display. In Anderson, please read col. 7, line 7 – col. 8, line 10 and see figs. 4-14.

Regarding **claims 11-15**, these claims are method claims corresponding to the apparatus claims 1-5, respectively. Therefore, method claims 11-15 are analyzed and rejected as previously discussed with respect to claims 1-5, respectively.

For **claim 21**, Anderson discloses a digital camera system (figs. 1-3) comprising:

a lens (220; col. 3, lines 44-49);

image sensing means (224) for sensing an image viewed by the lens (col. 3, lines 50-56);

display means (402) for displaying the image sensed by the image sensor (col. 4, lines 4-23);

storage means (350, 354, 356) for storing the image sensed by the image sensor (col. 4, lines 4-36); and

processing means (118) coupled to the display, lens, image sensor, and storage device (col. 3, line 26 – col. 4, line 58) that embodies a processing algorithm (344; col. 4, lines 4-15) that:

provides (408; col. 5, lines 53-67) a user interface for selecting if a composite photograph is to be taken (col. 6, lines 53-61) and for identifying a location of a first photograph to be taken (col. 7, lines 7-35; figs. 7A and 8);

after the first photograph has been taken, overlays indicia on the display indicating an overlapping area within a second photograph that is to be taken (col. 7, lines 31-42; fig. 9); and

uses the overlaid indicia that indicate the overlapping area within the second photograph as the overlaid indicia moves over the image displayed on the display as the camera is moved to

a position to take the second photograph, which overlaid indicia is used to align and place the second photograph relative to the first photograph (col. 7, lines 7-42; fig. 9).

However, Anderson does not expressly teach a system that uses video object tracking to track the overlaid indicia.

In a similar field of endeavor, Mukai discloses a system that uses video object tracking to track the overlaid indicia as the overlaid indicia moves over the image displayed on the display (figs. 18-19A/B; col. 8, line 64 – col. 9, line 58). In light of the teach of Mukai, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the system of Anderson with a system as recited in Claim 21 in order to assist the user in determining the composition of the image to be photographed (Mukai, col. 1, lines 26-45).

6. **Claims 6-8 and 16-18** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Anderson (U.S. Pat. #6,657,667) in view of Mukai et al. (U.S. Pat. #5,557,358) as applied to claims 1 and 11 above, and further in view of Tamayama et al. (U.S. Pat. #6,545,708).

For **claim 6**, Anderson, as modified by Sakaegi, discloses recited in Claim 1 the system wherein the indicia comprises the first photograph (col. 7, lines 7-18; figs. 6 and 8-10). However, Anderson does not expressly disclose that the indicia comprises a shadow copy of the first photograph.

In a similar field of endeavor, Tamayama discloses a system wherein the indicia (figs. 5/7, refs. 100-104) comprises a shadow copy of the first photograph (ref. 101-102). Please read Tamayama, col. 6, line 62 – col. 7, line 9 and col. 11, lines 18-25. In light of the teaching of Tamayama, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the

Art Unit: 2622

invention was made to modify the system of Anderson with a shadow copy of the first photograph so that the color of the area within the frame is different from that of any other area thereby providing a conspicuous appearance (Tamayama, col. 7, lines 6-9).

For **claim 7**, Anderson, modified by Sakaegi and Tamayama, discloses the system recited in Claim 6 wherein the shadow copy comprises a transparent image (Tamayama, figs. 5/7, refs. 100-104; col. 6, line 62 – col. 7, line 9 and col. 11, lines 18-25.).

For **claim 8**, Anderson, modified by Sakaegi and Tamayama, discloses the system recited in Claim 6 wherein the shadow copy comprises a translucent image (Tamayama, figs. 5/7, refs. 100-104; col. 6, line 62 – col. 7, line 9 and col. 11, lines 18-25.).

Regarding **claims 16-18**, these claims are method claims corresponding to the apparatus claims 6-8, respectively. Therefore, method claims 16-18 are analyzed and rejected as previously discussed with respect to claims 6-8, respectively.

7. **Claim 10** is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Anderson (U.S. Pat. #6,657,667) in view of Mukai et al. (U.S. Pat. #5,557,358) as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Dunton (U.S. Pat. #6,304,284).

For **claim 10**, Anderson, as modified by Mukai, teaches that the system recited in Claim 1 wherein the zones of the LCD can have a zigzag dividing line (col. 9, lines 6-10). However, Anderson does not expressly disclose the system wherein the algorithm guides the user to take photographs in a zigzag fashion. In a similar field of endeavor, Dunton teaches a system where an algorithm (fig. 1B, ref. 166) guides the user to take photographs in a zigzag fashion (see fig. 1B and read col. 4, lines 12-34). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill

in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the processor of Anderson an algorithm for guiding the user to take photographs in a zigzag fashion in order to provide another procedure for creating a single composite image without gaps between the images (Dunton, col. 1, lines 46-54).

8. **Claims 19-20** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Anderson (U.S. Pat. #6,657,667) in view of Tsuda et al. (U.S. Pat. #6,008,844).

For **claim 19**, Anderson teaches a method for use with a digital camera having a lens (col. 3, lines 44-49), an image sensor for sensing an image viewed by the lens (col. 3, lines 50-56), a display for displaying the image sensed by the image sensor (col. 4, lines 4-23), a storage device for storing the image sensed by the image sensor (col. 4, lines 4-36), a user interface (col. 5, lines 53-67), and processing circuitry coupled to the display, lens, image sensor, user interface and storage device (col. 3, line 26 – col. 4, line 58), the method comprising the steps of:

- (1) taking a photograph (col. 7, lines 7-35);
- (2) displaying the photograph on the display (col. 7, lines 7-35);
- (3) using a user interface to select that a composite photograph is to be taken (col. 6, lines 53-61; col. 7, lines 7-35);
- (4) using the user interface to indicate in which direction a subsequent photograph is to be taken (col. 8, lines 1-10);
- (5) making the displayed image transparent (zones – see figs. 6 and 8-10, ref. 440);
- (6) tracking the transparent displayed image as the transparent displayed image moves across the display in a direction that is opposite to the direction of the subsequent photograph

until the transparent displayed image overlaps a predetermined portion of the subsequent photograph that is to be taken, which overlap is used to align and place the subsequent photograph relative to the photograph (col. 6, lines 36-52; col. 7, lines 7 – col. 8, lines 10);

(7) taking the subsequent photograph (col. 8, lines 1-10); and

(8) repeating steps (4) through (7) until all photographs making up the composite photograph are taken (see figs. 7A/B).

However, Anderson does not expressly teach a system that using video object tracking to track the transparent displayed image as the transparent displayed image moves across the display.

In a similar field of endeavor, Tsuda discloses a system that using video object tracking to track the transparent displayed image as the transparent displayed image moves across the display (figs. 5A-5C; col. 5, lines 34-65). In light of the teach of Tsuda, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the system of Anderson with a system as recited in claim 19 in order to provide a high quality display thereby making a natural display irrespective of its aspect ratio (Tsuda, col. 3, lines 16-26).

For **claim 20**, Anderson, as modified by Tsuda, teaches the method recited in Claim 19 further comprising the steps of: using the user interface to select that the composite photograph is complete; and returning the display to normal, nontransparent, operation. In Anderson, please see figs. 5, ref. 402 and 7A, Steps 566, 568, and 570; and read col. 9, lines 48-59.

Conclusion

9. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Fredlund (US 7327890)	A method is provided for determining an area of importance in an archival image.
Stavelly et al. (US 7349020)	A system and method for displaying image composition templates with preview images
Soga et al. (US 6806906)	An assistance frame is displayed in a form superimposed on the image of the subject and the composition of a photograph to be obtained by shooting the subject is decided based upon the assistance frame.

10. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Carramah J. Quiett whose telephone number is (571)272-7316. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:00-5:00 M-F.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, NgocYen Vu can be reached on (571) 272-7320. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/C. J. Q./
Examiner, Art Unit 2622
October 10, 2008

*/Ngoc-Yen T. VUI/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2622*